

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. Claims 1-3, 5-8, 11 and 12 have been rejected. Claims 4, 9, 10, 13, 16 and 20 are objected to but deemed to be allowable if rewritten. Claims 1, 4, 6, and 14-17 are amended herein.

Claim 4, which has been indicated to be allowable in paragraph 5 of the Office Action, has been amended into independent form.

Also, enclosed is a copy of the confirming postcard evidencing receipt of the certified copy of the priority document with the application papers as filed on March 22, 2004.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that receipt of the certified copy of the priority document be acknowledged in the next official communication from the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office.

The Rejections

1. Claims 14-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph in paragraph 2 of the Office Action. More particularly, the Office Action states that the term "pedestal like design" is unclear. Claims 14-17 have been amended to delete this phrase and recite the appropriate structure, i.e., the blind hole 36 extends around the outer circumference of recess 18 to receive and seat rim or flange 34 of the deceleration device 26. Claim 6, although not explicitly rejected, is also amended for the same reason. Support for this amendment may be found, e.g., at the top of page 4 of the specification and in the various figures in the application. (Reference is made to the preferred embodiments illustrated in the drawings).

2. Claims 1-3, 6-8, 14, 15 and 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Great Britain Patent No. 446,972 (hereinafter "GB '972"). GB '972 is directed to an anti-bang or rattle door stop.

Claim 1 is amended herein to recite, *inter alia*, that the housing of the braking deceleration device 26 is removably retained in the accommodation recess 18 or 20 of the adaptor body 16, and the adaptor body 16 also comprises one smooth external surface 30 or 32 structured and arranged to allow the adaptor body 16 to be removably fixed to the frame or furniture 10. For example, the adaptor body 16 is attached to furniture 10 by double sided adhesive tape or other suitable adhesive with requiring the use of a tool or preparing the furniture. The braking deceleration device 26 is press fit into the accommodation recess 18, 20 of the adaptor 16. (Claims 6 and 14-17) Support for the amendment to independent claim 1 can be found, e.g., throughout the present application and drawings.

The present invention provides an adaptor 16 for a braking deceleration device 26 which can be easily and removably secured to furniture 10 adjacent a door 12 and securely and removably receive the deceleration device 26 to provide the desired damping effect. GB '972 fails to teach or suggest the features of the claimed adaptor 16 and accompanying advantages for the following reasons.

The door stop casing K shown in GB '972 requires precise dimensions to be permanently affixed to the doors or walls by bolts. (Figs. 2 and 3). Moreover, the door stop cylinder M is retained in casing K by means of screw caps Q and N on the ends thereof (page 2, column 1,

lines 35-45), unlike the adaptor 16 of the present invention, which is designed to receive and retain the braking deceleration device 26 by a press fit. (Please see, e.g., claims 6 and 14-17).

Accordingly, GB '972 neither discloses nor suggests the invention as now claimed.

3. Claims 5, 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over GB '972 in paragraph 4 of the Office Action.

Claims 5, 11 and 12 are directed to the use of double sided adhesive tape as a means of securing the adaptor to the furniture body. GB '972 employs screw fasteners to permanently affix the casing K to the door. There is no suggestion of using a non-permanent means such as double-sided adhesive tape to secure the door stop.


Moreover, Claims 5, 11 and 12 depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 1, which is submitted to be allowable for the reasons stated above. Accordingly, these claims are also submitted to be allowable.

Appln. No. 10/805,697
Amendment dated October 26, 2005
Reply to the Office Action of May 26, 2005

CONCLUSION

For at least the reasons stated above, all of the pending claims are submitted to be patentable and in condition for allowance, the same being respectfully requested. Please contact the undersigned attorney should there be any questions. A petition for a two month extension of time for response under 37 C.F.R. 1.136(a) is included in duplicate with the fee.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Adrian T. Calderone', written in a cursive style.

Adrian T. Calderone
Registration No. 31,746
Attorney for Applicant(s)

DILWORTH & BARRESE, LLP.
333 Earle Ovington Boulevard
Uniondale, New York 11553
Tel: (516) 228-8484
Fax: (516) 228-8516

ATC:mg